



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,435	12/26/2000	Hiroyuki Sekitani	001499	1560

7590 04/17/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
McLELAND & NAUGHTON
1725 K. Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

6

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

PRC

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,435

Applicant(s)

SEKITANI, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 04-February-2003, claim 1 is amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-3 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (U.S. patent No. 5,909,688) in view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 6,202,070), and further in view of McCain et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,482.)

As to claim 1, Yoshioka et al teaches an information management system for manufacturing machines (see Abstract) comprising:

a database (see figure 2) that manages input and output in addition to memory of individual machine information (see column 6, line 59 through column 7, line 6), which is a body of information concerning each machine (see column 9, lines 29-37);

Art Unit: 2175

an information processing means for each of the company departments (see column 13, line 66 through column ~~13~~¹⁴, line 2); and

an access means (see column 2, lines 56-67) that is installed in each of the information processing means which is capable of performing addition and updating of the individual machine information (see column 21, lines 14-22.)

Yoshioka et al does not teach:

wherein each manufacturing machine is a tooling machine used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production; and

each manufacturing machine as products of a company, the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement and production, as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information.

Nguyen et al teaches a computer manufacturing system architecture with enhanced software distribution functions (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

wherein each manufacturing machine is a tooling machine used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production (see column 8, lines 51-67); and

each manufacturing machine as products of a company (see column 24, lines 51-62, where “building of machines to the specification of individual customers” indicate that each machine is a product of the company”); the individual machine information including parts books (see column 47, lines 4-21, where “parts books” is read on “listing of all the part numbers”), drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement and production (see

Art Unit: 2175

column 8, lines 51-67), as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information (see column 24, lines 51-58.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Yoshioka et al to include wherein each manufacturing machine is a tooling machine used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company; the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement and production, as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Yoshioka et al by the teachings of Nguyen et al, because wherein each manufacturing machine is a tooling machine used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production, would result in the reduction of distribution time, and lowering distribution cost, and would result in more efficient updates during production, as explained by Nguyen et al (see column 9, lines 43); and because each manufacturing machine as products of a company; the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement and production, as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information, would enable the system to provide the users with all the necessary information they would need to install, update and utilize the desired components on their production machine.

Yoshioka et al as modified, still does not teach maintenance information obtained after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine in an industrial manufacturing facility.

McCain et al teaches a communications, information, maintenance diagnostic and training system (see Abstract), in which he teaches maintenance information obtained (see column 1, lines 40-48) after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine (see column 9, lines 59-62, where “after the start of operation” is read on “continuously monitor the operation of machines and system on the factory floor”) in an industrial manufacturing facility (see column 4, lines 17-20.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Yoshioka et al as modified to include maintenance information obtained after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine in an industrial manufacturing facility.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Yoshioka et al as modified, with the teaching of McCain et al, because including maintenance information obtained after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine in an industrial manufacturing facility, would enable the system to obtain detailed post-installation maintenance data from manufacturing machines, in order to diagnose and expedite appropriate updates and repairs.

As to claim 2, Yoshioka et al as modified teaches wherein the database is connected to the information processing means (see Yoshioka et al, figure 2) of the departments (see Yoshioka et al, figure 4A) and the customers via a network (see Yoshioka et al, column 12, lines 32-38, where “terminal 21” represents a “customer”), information processing means of the customers having an access means that is capable of performing addition and updating the individual machine information of the database (see Yoshioka et al, column 3, lines 1-7.)

As to claim 3, Yoshioka et al as modified teaches wherein the company departments include a sales department, a technical department, a procurement department, a production department, and a maintenance service department (see Nguyen et al, column 11, lines 6-13, where “distribution” and “cross-departmental coordination” are taught. It is inherent that larger companies consist of various departments including Sales, Technical, Procurement, Production, and Maintenance Service departments”), with the database having an access limiting function that limits addition and updating of information in the individual machine information depending on the departments and the customers (see Nguyen et al, column 9, lines 19-25.)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 04-February-2003 with respect to claims 1-3 have been fully considered but they are either not found to be persuasive, or are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection:

In response to the applicant's argument that "the prior art relied upon does not disclose or suggest that the manufacturing machine is a tooling machine used in an industrial manufacturing facility for production purposes", the argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Applicant is kindly directed to the remarks and comments made in the amended independent claim 1 above.

In response to the applicant's argument that "the prior art relied upon does not disclose or suggest that the machine information includes maintenance information taken after initial start up of the manufacturing machine in the industrial manufacturing facility", the argument has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2175

6. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

March 28, 2003


DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100